

### REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were examined. Claims 17, 19, and 23 are canceled. To expedite prosecution, claims 1, 10, 16, 20, and 24 are amended. The Applicant submits that these amendments merely make explicit that which was implicit in the claims as originally filed. As such, no new matter has been entered. The Applicant submits that the amendments are being done to improve readability and do not represent a narrowing of any feature of the claims. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these amendments do not narrow the scope of any claim limitation within the meaning of the decision in *Festo*. No new matter has been presented.

### CLAIM 1 IS ALLOWABLE OVER FURENDAL

Claim 1-16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,293,596 to Furendal et al. (hereinafter "Furendal").

Claim 1 (as amended to correct for antecedent basis) recites exposing the organic film to a vapor of a solvent for a period of time sufficient to render at least an outermost portion of the organic film insoluble in the solvent without heat treatment of the film after exposure to the vapor. From this language, it is clear that exposure to the vapor of the solvent results in a film that has an outer layer insoluble in the same solvent that provided the vapor. Support can be found in the present application at page 3 lines 29-30. Applicant fails to see where this solvent resistance is shown in the Furendal reference. All examples provided by Furendal fail to show that the resulting film is insoluble in the same solvent that provided the vapor and formed without heat treatment. Specifically, Furendal does not show that its films are resistant to the same solvent that provides the vapor (Furendal is typically void of any testing of the resulting film). For the examples that do show testing and some resistance, those examples use heat treatment to provide that resistance.

Aside from Example 20, only Example 16 (heated to 120° for 30 minutes), Example 29 (heated to 120 ° for 3 hours), and Example 30 (heated to 120 ° for 3 hours) are vapor-based examples in Furendal where the resulting film was tested in solvent. All of these examples, however, had post-solvent exposure heat treatment to provide this type of resistance. No examples are provided showing that any of the others without heat treatment could withstand the same solvent used for solvent vapor annealing. Applicant further submits that the embodiment of the invention set forth in claim 1 shows a surprising result in that, based on Furendal, one of

skill in the art would not expect a polymer film exposed to solvent vapor to be solvent resistant to the same solvent that provided the vapor without having to heat the polymer film. Support for this feature may be found in the specification at page 3, lines 29-30.

Applicant further submits that Example 20 describes an example of non-vapor-based solvent annealing. As such, Example 20 is not relevant to the claimed invention. Example 20 also shows that some resulting films were entirely soluble in solvent (col. 29, line 11). Applicant also notes that the resulting film was exposed to methyl ethyl ketone as the solvent, but tested with acetone as the solvent. Thus, example 20 did not test the resulting film using the same solvent as the solvent used to provide the solvent anneal, again making it different from what is claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, Furendal does not show or suggest a film insoluble in the same solvent that provided the vapor and formed without heat treatment

Based on the aforementioned, Claim 1 and its dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

#### **CLAIM 10 IS ALLOWABLE OVER FURENDAL**

Amended Claim 10 is also allowable over Furendal as it recites that the first solvent and second solvent are the same. This means that the film when deposited, also contains the same solvent that is used in the vapor to anneal it. In the examples provided by Furendal, the main solvent used to form the film is water. None of the Furendal references, however, use water vapor to anneal the film. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Furendal does not teach all features of claim 10 as it presently stands in the application. Based on the aforementioned, Claim 10 and its dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

#### **CLAIM 20 IS ALLOWABLE OVER FURENDAL**

To expedite prosecution, claim 20 has been amended to include the elements recited in allowable claim 22. Based on the aforementioned, Claim 20 and its dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION:**

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicant submits that all claims are allowable over the cited art and define an invention suitable for patent protection. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the amendment, reconsider the application, and issue a Notice of Allowance in the next Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

**/Joshua D. Isenberg/**

Joshua D. Isenberg  
Reg. No. 41,088  
Patent Attorney

Date: May 22, 2007

JDI PATENT  
809 Corporate Way  
Fremont, CA 94539  
tel.: (510) 668-0965  
fax.: (510) 668-0239